

A PURPLE WAY POLICY AND OPINION BOOK

THE PURPLE WAY FOR AI

BUILD THE FUTURE. PROTECT THE PEOPLE.

Why a Public-Benefit Compact Is Better Than a Blanket AI Data
Center Moratorium

RUSTIN PENLAND

August 2026

Publication Note

This book presents the Purple Way AI Public-Benefit Compact as a proposed policy framework. It is not enacted law and is not offered as legal advice. Any real agreement would require constitutional, procurement, antitrust, utility, environmental, labor, tax, and local-law review.

The discussion of H.R. 9442 is based on the introduced legislation available through the U.S. Government Publishing Office. The book analyzes policy, not personalities. It recognizes legitimate concerns raised by the bill while arguing for a different remedy.

The concluding AI assessment is a reasoned opinion about the two policy approaches described here. It does not claim authority over the voter and should not be represented as an official endorsement by any AI company or public institution.

Copyright © 2026 Rustin Penland. All rights reserved.

Contents

Introduction: The Choice Is Not AI or No AI

Chapter 1: What AOC's Moratorium Bill Would Do

Chapter 2: Why the Moratorium Has Public Appeal

Chapter 3: The Limits of a Blanket Freeze

Chapter 4: The Purple Way Foundation

Chapter 5: The AI Public-Benefit Compact

Chapter 6: Electricity Without Sending the Bill to Families

Chapter 7: Water, Land, Noise, and the Local Community

Chapter 8: Workers Must Become Owners of the Transition

Chapter 9: Safety Without Making Washington Approve Every Tool

Chapter 10: Competition, Small Business, and National Strength

Chapter 11: From AI Expansion to Lower Recurring Costs

Chapter 12: Enforcement Makes the Difference

Chapter 13: A Side-by-Side Policy Comparison

Chapter 14: How Government Could Put the Purple Way Into Practice

Chapter 15: Hard Questions the Purple Way Must Answer

Chapter 16: AI Policy Assessment - What Should the Voter Choose?

Conclusion: Build the Future in a Way That Builds the People

Appendix A: Model Compact Terms

Appendix B: A Voter's Evaluation Checklist

Appendix C: Source Notes

Appendix D: Glossary

Introduction: The Choice Is Not AI or No AI

America is being asked to make a decision about artificial intelligence before the full consequences of that technology are known. Large data centers are arriving quickly. They can demand enormous amounts of electricity, water, land, transmission capacity, and public attention. At the same time, artificial intelligence can increase productivity, strengthen businesses, accelerate research, improve public services, and help people perform work that once required far more time and money.

The political argument is often presented as a choice between two extremes. One side says the country should let technology companies build as quickly as possible because innovation must not be slowed. The other side says the country should stop major construction until Washington creates a comprehensive national system of safeguards. Both sides recognize something real. Innovation matters, and so do the people who must live with its consequences.

This book presents a third choice: the Purple Way.

The Purple Way does not ask the nation to surrender to powerful companies. It also does not treat productive investment as an enemy that must be frozen. It asks a more useful question: What must a company deliver to the people in exchange for the privilege of placing an enormous new demand on their grid, water, land, workforce, and community?

Under the Purple Way, a major AI data center would be permitted to grow only through a transparent and enforceable Public-Benefit Compact. The company could earn profit and expand its productive capacity, but private gain would be joined to measurable public gain. New electricity generation, grid improvements, water protection, technical education, worker transition, small-business computing access, safety audits, and household savings would become part of the price of permission.

This is a policy and opinion book. It compares a real federal proposal, H.R. 9442, with a Purple Way framework that has not been enacted into law. It does not claim that a contract can remove every risk or guarantee that every price will fall. It argues that disciplined growth, measured against public results, is more constructive than either a free-for-all or an indefinite national freeze.

CORE ARGUMENT: Do not stop wealth creation. Do not surrender to it. Contract with it so that private expansion must also expand the nation's productive capital.

The final chapter offers an AI policy assessment of what voters should choose if the decision is between H.R. 9442 as written and the Purple Way alternative developed in these pages. That opinion is direct, but it is not presented as infallible or as a substitute for a citizen's judgment.

Chapter 1: What AOC's Moratorium Bill Would Do

Representative Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez introduced H.R. 9442, the Artificial Intelligence Data Center Moratorium Act, on June 24, 2026. Senator Bernie Sanders introduced the Senate companion, S. 4214. The proposal responds to growing concern about the speed of AI development and the infrastructure required to support it.

The bill would prohibit the construction of covered new AI data centers and the upgrading of covered existing facilities after enactment. Its definition includes facilities used for the development or operation of AI models at scale. It also reaches certain facilities with a maximum rated power capacity or peak load above 20 megawatts when they use high-density server racks or liquid-cooling systems.

The pause is described politically as a temporary moratorium, but the legislation does not establish a six-month or one-year expiration date. Construction could resume only after Congress enacted one or more laws satisfying the bill's requirements and expressly terminating the moratorium.

Those future laws would have to provide, among other things:

- Federal review and approval of AI products before release to determine whether they are safe and effective.
- Policies intended to prevent AI-related job displacement and ensure that AI-generated wealth is shared with the American people.
- Protection against consumer electricity or utility increases caused by new or upgraded AI data centers.
- Environmental and climate protections.
- Authority for affected communities to approve or reject construction and upgrades.
- A prohibition on government subsidies for covered data centers.
- Union jobs, prevailing wages, registered apprenticeships, and project labor agreements.

The bill would also require quarterly Department of Energy reporting about covered data centers. Reporting would include energy and water use, greenhouse-gas emissions, wastewater, cooling chemicals, noise, wages, benefits, jobs, land agreements, utility agreements, and subsidy certifications. The Department could use subpoenas, written questions, inspections, and permitting conditions to verify compliance.

Finally, the legislation would restrict the export, reexport, or in-country transfer of U.S.-origin computing infrastructure hardware for large-scale AI uses in countries that do not have laws comparable to the safeguards required by the bill.

These are not minor provisions. H.R. 9442 is not simply a local zoning pause intended to allow a six-month study. It links the future of major AI infrastructure to a much larger national settlement covering product approval, employment, wealth distribution, energy, environmental protection, labor policy, local consent, subsidies, and international technology controls.

STATUS NOTE: The official introduced text records the bill's introduction and committee referral. This book analyzes the proposal as written; it does not describe the bill as enacted law.

Chapter 2: Why the Moratorium Has Public Appeal

The concerns behind H.R. 9442 should not be dismissed. The U.S. Department of Energy reported that data centers used approximately 4.4 percent of U.S. electricity in 2023 and projected that their share could rise to approximately 6.7 to 12 percent by 2028. Its July 2026 draft transmission study identified AI-related data-center expansion as a major source of demand growth, including significant pressure in Texas and Virginia.

Demand of that scale can create problems when companies connect without adequate planning. Generation and transmission can take years to build. If a special contract assigns too little risk to the data-center customer, families may support infrastructure built primarily for a private load, and reliability can suffer when demand grows faster than dependable supply.

Water is another legitimate concern. Cooling technologies vary, but the Government Accountability Office has found that generative AI can require significant energy and water while companies often disclose too little information for confident public measurement. That uncertainty supports reporting, auditing, and enforceable local water budgets.

Workers also have reason to pay attention. AI can raise productivity and create occupations, but it may eliminate tasks faster than people can adjust. A promise that "new jobs will appear" is not enough for someone whose work disappears before the new opportunity becomes reachable.

Safety, privacy, civil rights, surveillance, cybersecurity, and misinformation are additional concerns. Because infrastructure determines how much computing power can be deployed, the sponsors believe a construction pause would give democratic institutions time to establish rules.

The Purple Way agrees with several parts of this diagnosis:

- Companies should not shift private infrastructure costs onto families.
- Communities deserve meaningful information and a voice.
- Water, energy, emissions, and noise should be measured.
- Workers deserve a path into the new economy rather than a speech about inevitable disruption.
- High-risk AI needs enforceable safety standards.
- Public subsidies should not be given away without verified public value.

The disagreement is principally about the remedy. Recognizing danger does not automatically prove that a nationwide construction freeze is the best response.

Chapter 3: The Limits of a Blanket Freeze

A moratorium can be useful when a government needs a short, defined period to study a local impact, correct a permitting gap, or respond to an emergency. H.R. 9442 is broader. It has no fixed sunset and no direct pathway allowing an exceptionally responsible project to proceed while Congress debates a much larger AI settlement.

That structure creates five major weaknesses.

First, the bill stops good projects with bad ones

A company prepared to build its own generation, pay for transmission, recycle water, protect household rates, train local workers, and accept independent audits would still face the moratorium if its project were covered. The proposal does not establish a performance-based permit that rewards a project for solving the very problems that motivated the pause.

Second, a pause does not create productive capacity

Stopping a data center does not build a power plant, a transmission line, a water-recycling system, a technical school, or a worker-transition program. A freeze may prevent a new burden, but it does not automatically create the resources necessary for safe growth. The nation can lose time without gaining capability.

Third, the exit conditions are politically expansive

The bill would remain in place until Congress enacted laws on product approval, job displacement, wealth sharing, environmental protection, utility costs, local approval, subsidies, and labor standards, and then expressly ended the moratorium. Any one of these subjects could generate years of disagreement. The word "temporary" therefore does not tell voters how long the practical prohibition would last.

Fourth, broad premarket approval can protect incumbents

High-risk AI applications may justify predeployment testing or government authorization. Requiring federal review and approval of AI products generally before release, however, risks creating a slow and expensive gate. The largest technology corporations could employ teams of lawyers and compliance specialists. A small American developer might not be able to do so. Regulation intended to restrain Big Tech could unintentionally strengthen Big Tech's market position.

Fifth, a domestic freeze does not freeze the world

The United States can restrict exports and pressure allies, but it cannot assume that every strategic competitor will adopt the same standards. National security does not justify a free-for-all, yet it does require a policy that preserves responsible American capacity, technical skill, supply chains, and research leadership.

The Purple Way treats these weaknesses as design problems. Instead of asking only whether construction should be stopped, it asks what conditions would make construction worthy of approval.

PURPLE WAY TEST: If a project cannot protect the public and produce measurable public value, it should not proceed. If it can do both under an enforceable contract, the country should not forbid it merely because Congress has not completed every part of national AI legislation.

Chapter 4: The Purple Way Foundation

The Purple Way is not a compromise created by mixing half of the Red program with half of the Blue program. It is a different way of understanding capital, government, obligation, and public progress.

Traditional politics often treats money as the principal capital. A problem appears, a tax or subsidy follows, and success is measured by dollars appropriated. The Purple Way recognizes that money can be necessary, but it is not the only or always the most transformative capital.

People carry knowledge, health, skill, tools, ownership, and the ability to create. Infrastructure carries power, water, transportation, communications, and production. These forms of capital can reduce recurring costs and strengthen independence.

This is the meaning of "the nation is a bank with feet." People are not empty recipients waiting for Washington. When their human capital is educated, equipped, and connected to opportunity, the nation gains wealth that can walk, work, learn, repair, invent, and multiply.

Human Capital Conservatism seeks to develop the productive power of the individual. It defines kindness as support that helps a person become stronger, healthier, more capable, and less vulnerable to recurring costs.

The Public Benefit Exchange applies that principle to large institutions. A corporation may receive permission, coordinated permitting, infrastructure planning, or another lawful advantage. In exchange, it must deliver independently verified benefits. Private gain is earned alongside public gain.

The Statesman Contract is the legal instrument. A Statesman is a temporary steward who negotiates transparently, establishes measurable duties, protects competition, and remains accountable to law.

A valid Statesman Contract must be:

- Lawful and consistent with constitutional, procurement, antitrust, utility, labor, and environmental requirements.
- Transparent before approval, subject to narrow protection for legitimate trade secrets and security information.
- Measurable through defined baselines and independent verification.
- Enforceable through bonds, milestones, clawbacks, penalties, and stop-work authority.
- Reversible when a company fails to perform.
- Open to competition so political relationships do not become private monopolies.

Chapter 5: The AI Public-Benefit Compact

The Compact would not be a ceremonial promise or a press release. It would be a binding project agreement connected to permits, interconnection rights, development phases, and operating authority.

The exchange is straightforward. A company seeks the right to construct or expand a major AI data center. The public seeks protection and productive benefit. The company may receive a coordinated pathway to build, predictable milestones, and regulatory clarity. The people receive infrastructure, savings, skills, access, safety, and enforceable protection.

The Compact would contain seven covenants:

1. An Energy and Ratepayer Covenant.
2. A Water and Environmental Covenant.
3. A Human Capital and Worker Transition Covenant.
4. A Community Benefit and Local Consent Covenant.
5. An AI Safety, Privacy, and Civil Rights Covenant.
6. A Competition and Small-Business Access Covenant.
7. A Transparency, Verification, and Enforcement Covenant.

Each covenant would contain a baseline, a measurable duty, a reporting method, an independent verifier, a remedy, and a trigger for pausing the next construction phase.

This is the difference between a slogan and a contract. "Do not raise electricity prices" is a slogan until the agreement defines the customers being protected, the price baseline, the period of measurement, the treatment of fuel and weather, the cost-allocation method, and the remedy if the promise fails. "Create good jobs" is a slogan until the contract defines the number of apprenticeships, required skills, completion standards, wages, local recruitment, and public reporting.

The Purple Way would not permit a company to purchase freedom from nonnegotiable safety laws. Core protections would remain mandatory. The negotiated exchange would operate above that legal floor by converting the company's need to build into additional productive benefits for the people.

THE COMPACT IN ONE SENTENCE: Permission to expand would be earned one verified phase at a time by protecting the public and delivering productive capital.

Chapter 6: Electricity Without Sending the Bill to Families

Electricity is the center of the data-center debate. A large AI project can operate continuously and may require power comparable to a city. The Purple Way answer is neither "connect first and solve the grid later" nor "build nothing." It is a capacity-matching obligation.

Before receiving final approval, the developer would submit an independently engineered power plan showing how dependable supply, transmission, distribution, backup capability, and demand flexibility would match the project's phased load. The plan could use an appropriate mix of generation, storage, efficiency, demand response, and grid improvements. The contract would focus on verified performance rather than selecting a favored technology by political slogan.

The company would be responsible for the direct infrastructure required to connect its load. Specialized facilities, substations, transmission upgrades, and reliability expenses primarily attributable to the project would not be quietly transferred to residential customers.

A ratepayer-protection mechanism would compare actual costs with a baseline approved by the relevant utility regulator. If the project caused identified costs to spill onto protected customers, the company would provide credits, reimburse the utility, or fund the corrective infrastructure. The exact mechanism would be established under state utility law; the promise would not rely on a vague guarantee that no bill could ever increase for any unrelated reason.

The Compact would also reward the creation of excess public capacity. A developer that adds dependable generation or storage beyond its own measured requirement could dedicate part of that value to community resilience, schools, hospitals, water systems, or household electricity credits. The public benefit would be delivered in productive service, not merely as money deposited into a general fund.

Construction would be phased. A hypothetical 500-megawatt project might begin with a much smaller first stage. The next stage would not open until the promised supply and grid work were operating, verified, and protecting reliability. The actual ratios would be determined by engineers and regulators for the specific region; a political document should not pretend that one number fits every grid.

Texas illustrates why this approach matters. The Department of Energy has identified Texas as one of the states facing particularly large projected data-center demand growth. Texas also has strong energy resources, engineering capability, industrial experience, and room for innovation. A Purple Way contract could turn the pressure of new load into a reason to build more dependable power and transmission than the private project alone would otherwise provide.

In that design, the data center does not merely consume the future. It helps finance the future.

Chapter 7: Water, Land, Noise, and the Local Community

National legislation cannot understand every watershed, aquifer, neighborhood, industrial corridor, or local grid. The Purple Way therefore combines a federal safety floor with state and local project knowledge.

Every Compact would contain a public resource budget. The developer would disclose expected water withdrawals, water consumption, wastewater, cooling chemicals, thermal output, noise, backup generation, emissions, land use, and emergency procedures. An independent expert would test the assumptions before construction and compare them with actual operations afterward.

In a water-stressed area, approval could require closed-loop cooling, reclaimed water, investment in leak reduction, aquifer protection, or a project-specific replenishment plan. In an industrial area with adequate reclaimed-water capacity, the best solution might differ. The standard would be no hidden transfer of environmental cost and no unsupported claim of being "water positive."

Local participation must also be real. A public hearing held after every material decision has already been made is not consent. Communities should receive understandable project information early enough to influence siting, setbacks, noise controls, road use, emergency planning, visual screening, and benefit priorities.

The Compact should create a Local Benefit Ledger showing what was promised, what was delivered, who verified it, and what remedy applies to a missed obligation. Residents should not need specialized legal knowledge to determine whether the agreement is being honored.

Local power, however, must also be protected from capture. A project should not be approved solely because a developer offers a visible gift while imposing larger hidden costs. Nor should a narrow group be able to extract private favors unrelated to legitimate public impacts. Benefits must be connected to measurable community needs and adopted through transparent law.

The Purple Way respects the local voice while requiring state and federal standards where consequences cross county or state lines.

Chapter 8: Workers Must Become Owners of the Transition

H.R. 9442 calls for policies to prevent job displacement. The moral concern is understandable, but a literal promise to prevent all displacement is not realistic. Technology has always changed tasks and occupations. The more responsible goal is to prevent abandonment.

The Purple Way Worker Transition Covenant would begin before displacement, not after a worker loses income. Companies seeking large-scale AI capacity would contribute training, instructors, equipment, apprenticeships, recognized credentials, and direct access to the technologies changing the workplace.

Programs would be tied to actual regional opportunities: electricians, lineworkers, cooling specialists, industrial maintenance technicians, cybersecurity analysts, fiber technicians, water-system operators, construction managers, data-center technicians, AI auditors, and small-business automation specialists. Education would be measured by completion, placement, earnings improvement, business formation, and durable skill, not by enrollment alone.

Workers outside the data center also matter. A local auto shop, manufacturer, farmer, contractor, retailer, or logistics company may gain more from practical AI tools than from a temporary grant. The Compact could provide shared computing credits, secure software access, technical assistance, and local AI service centers that help small businesses become more productive without surrendering their data or independence.

When AI produces substantial gains, the public return should emphasize productive ownership. Depending on law and project design, that return could include community energy assets, training endowments, infrastructure shares, compute capacity, employee ownership arrangements, or revenue dedicated to verified cost reduction. The purpose is not to promise an unlimited check. It is to give people capital that increases future earning and saving power.

This is where the Purple Way differs from both laissez-faire disruption and permanent subsidy. The worker is not treated as collateral damage, and the worker is not treated as a lifelong dependent. The worker becomes an owner of the transition through knowledge, tools, access, and productive opportunity.

HUMAN CAPITAL STANDARD: The measure of compassion is not how much money passes through a program. It is how much stronger, more capable, and less vulnerable the person becomes.

Chapter 9: Safety Without Making Washington Approve Every Tool

AI risk is not uniform. A spelling assistant, a medical diagnostic system, a military targeting system, an employment-screening tool, and an autonomous controller for critical infrastructure should not pass through an identical regulatory gate.

The Purple Way would establish risk tiers.

- Ordinary low-risk tools would remain subject to normal consumer protection, privacy, security, competition, and liability laws.
- Systems affecting employment, credit, housing, education, insurance, or access to essential services would face impact testing, notice, appeal, audit, and anti-discrimination duties.
- Systems used in medicine, critical infrastructure, public safety, mass surveillance, weapons, or highly autonomous operations would face stronger predeployment review, controlled testing, incident reporting, and continuing oversight.
- Frontier systems capable of causing widespread harm would face capability evaluations, security requirements, staged deployment, and emergency restrictions.

This structure borrows a sound principle from the National Institute of Standards and Technology: AI risk should be governed, mapped, measured, and managed across the system's life cycle. The NIST framework is currently voluntary, but its practical structure can inform enforceable rules and contract duties.

Every covered data-center Compact would require the operator and major AI tenants to maintain safety documentation appropriate to their risk tier. High-risk tenants would disclose testing and incident information to qualified authorities. Independent auditors would test cybersecurity, privacy, discrimination controls, misuse protections, and emergency procedures.

The Compact would prohibit the use of public-benefit access as a disguise for unlawful surveillance. A school receiving computing services, for example, should not have to surrender student data for unrelated commercial use. A city receiving traffic analysis should not silently create a system of continuous personal tracking.

Federal premarket review would therefore be concentrated where the possible harm justifies it. This protects the public without forcing every small developer and ordinary software update into the same permission line.

Chapter 10: Competition, Small Business, and National Strength

A national freeze can produce an unintended advantage for companies that already own enormous data centers. If new construction stops, existing capacity becomes scarcer and more valuable. The firms with the largest installed base may gain power while new competitors face a closed gate.

The Purple Way addresses concentration directly. Public incentives and accelerated permitting would be awarded through open, published standards. The contract would prohibit exclusive side arrangements that prevent competing suppliers, energy developers, or local businesses from participating. Benefits would be portable where practical so a school or small company is not permanently locked into one vendor.

Large projects could be required to reserve a defined portion of training, procurement, or computing-access opportunities for qualified small and regional businesses. This would not guarantee contracts to unqualified firms. It would ensure that transparent pathways exist for capable businesses to compete.

National security must also be part of the analysis. The United States needs secure domestic computing capacity, energy infrastructure, skilled workers, semiconductors, networking equipment, and research institutions. Export controls can be necessary for defined security threats. A broad rule that depends on foreign countries adopting an entire American social and regulatory program, however, may be difficult to administer and could separate the United States from partners without changing the conduct of adversaries.

The Purple Way would use targeted, risk-based export controls coordinated with allies while continuing responsible domestic development. Safety and strength are not opposites. A country that loses its productive capacity can become less able to enforce its values.

Chapter 11: From AI Expansion to Lower Recurring Costs

The broader Purple Way asks how productive capital can reduce the recurring costs that keep families dependent on debt, subsidies, and emergency assistance. AI infrastructure can contribute to that goal, but only if the benefit is designed into the agreement.

A data center that merely consumes power may increase cost pressure. A Compact that brings new supply, pays its grid expenses, contributes excess capacity, improves water systems, and gives small businesses productive technology can have the opposite effect. It can increase the amount of useful output the economy receives from its energy, labor, knowledge, and infrastructure.

The connection to monetary pressure must be stated carefully. One data-center contract will not control the Federal Reserve, guarantee monetary contraction, or return prices to a past decade. Prices and monetary policy respond to many forces, including productivity, supply, wages, credit, fiscal policy, expectations, global trade, and shocks.

The Purple Way argument is cumulative. When society repeatedly increases productive capacity while reducing recurring dependence on debt and rescue spending, it can reduce some of the pressure that leads institutions to answer every problem with more money. Lower energy costs, stronger workers, more efficient small businesses, and durable infrastructure increase real capacity. When real capacity grows faster than financial claims upon it, price pressure can ease over time.

This is why productive benefit is superior to an unmeasured subsidy. A temporary payment may help a family this month. A durable reduction in electricity cost, combined with greater earning capacity, can improve the family's position month after month.

The Purple Way does not promise economic magic. It proposes a direction: productivity first, independence rising, recurring costs falling where performance makes that possible, and monetary contraction following only when the real economy can safely support it.

Chapter 12: Enforcement Makes the Difference

The greatest weakness of many public-private agreements is not the idea but the enforcement. Companies announce jobs that never appear, governments celebrate investment without measuring public cost, and community benefits become difficult to trace.

The Purple Way must therefore be harder on performance than ordinary political dealmaking.

Before construction begins, the developer would post a performance bond or equivalent financial security sized to the public risk. The Compact would divide construction into defined phases. Each phase would have conditions that must be verified before the next phase receives permission.

The public dashboard would report a limited set of understandable measures:

- Project electricity demand and dependable supply added.
- Grid and interconnection expenses paid by the project.
- Measured effect on protected utility customers.
- Water withdrawn, consumed, recycled, discharged, and replenished.
- Temporary jobs, permanent jobs, wages, apprenticeships, and completions.
- Local procurement and small-business participation.
- Computing credits, training resources, and community infrastructure delivered.
- Safety audits, material incidents, corrective actions, and unresolved violations.

Independent verification would prevent the company from controlling its own auditor. Regulators would receive necessary raw data, while public reports would protect legitimate security and trade-secret information.

Remedies would escalate. A reporting failure could require correction and a fine. A missed infrastructure milestone could stop the next phase. Material ratepayer or water violations could trigger credits, bond recovery, or operating restrictions. Fraud or repeated serious violations could terminate the Compact and disqualify responsible entities.

Government officials would also face rules. Negotiations, scoring, gifts, conflicts, and material amendments would be disclosed. An official could not quietly weaken an approved agreement.

No policy can eliminate capture, but transparent baselines, independent audits, automatic triggers, and reversible benefits make capture more difficult and more visible.

Chapter 13: A Side-by-Side Policy Comparison

Question	H.R. 9442	Purple Way Compact
Basic method	Pause covered construction and upgrades until Congress enacts a broad safeguard package.	Permit construction in verified phases when the project protects the public and produces measurable benefit.
Duration	No fixed sunset; ends only through qualifying legislation that expressly terminates the moratorium.	Project-specific milestones, review dates, and automatic stop-work triggers.
Electricity	Future law must prevent consumer utility increases.	Company-funded connection, capacity matching, approved cost baseline, credits or reimbursement, and phase gates.
Workers	Future policy must prevent displacement and share AI-generated wealth.	Early transition, apprenticeships, portable skills, productive ownership, and small-business access measured by outcomes.
Safety	Federal review and approval of AI products before release.	Risk-tiered rules: ordinary law for low risk; strong predeployment review for high-risk and frontier systems.
Community	Affected communities must be empowered to approve or reject projects.	Early local participation plus a public Local Benefit Ledger and enforceable siting terms.
Competition	The freeze applies to covered new capacity, while existing capacity remains valuable.	Open project standards, anti-favoritism rules, portability, and pathways for qualified small businesses.
Enforcement	Construction prohibition, DOE reporting, inspections, subpoenas, and permitting conditions.	Bonds, audits, public metrics, clawbacks, phased permissions, and termination, in addition to legal standards.

The comparison shows why the Purple Way is not a weaker version of regulation. It can be stricter where performance matters because it attaches construction rights to verified results. At the same time, it is more flexible where an innovative project can satisfy the public standard through a better technical solution.

H.R. 9442 has one powerful enforcement tool: stop covered construction. The Purple Way retains stop-work authority but places it at the end of a graduated performance system. A project can proceed only as it earns each phase.

The Purple Way also separates national rules from project exchange. Privacy, civil rights, national security, and high-risk AI safety belong in generally applicable law. Additional energy, water, workforce, and community benefits can be tailored through a contract without allowing a company to negotiate away the legal floor.

Chapter 14: How Government Could Put the Purple Way Into Practice

Implementation would occur at three levels.

Federal level: establish the floor

Congress would define risk-based AI duties, national security controls, civil-rights protections, transparency requirements, interstate reporting standards, and model rules for major computing facilities. Federal law would authorize a uniform Compact framework while preserving stronger state protections that do not discriminate unlawfully against interstate commerce.

State level: protect the grid and negotiate productive exchange

States would integrate Compacts with utility regulation, environmental review, workforce systems, and economic-development law. Public utility commissions would approve ratepayer baselines and cost allocation. State agencies would publish model contract terms and competitive scoring criteria.

Local level: shape siting and community benefit

Local governments would address land use, roads, noise, emergency services, setbacks, construction schedules, and locally prioritized benefits. Residents would receive information early enough to influence the agreement.

The first year could follow a practical sequence:

1. Adopt an interim rule requiring disclosure and phased review for covered projects.
2. Establish independent energy, water, workforce, safety, and public-finance panels.
3. Publish a model Compact and measurable scoring system.
4. Select a small number of pilot projects through open competition.
5. Require bonds and public dashboards before physical expansion.
6. Audit results after the first operating stage.
7. Amend the model based on evidence before wider use.

Projects unable or unwilling to meet the standard would not receive approval. Projects that perform could demonstrate a safer national pathway without waiting for a complete settlement of every AI policy question.

Chapter 15: Hard Questions the Purple Way Must Answer

Is this simply corporate favoritism under a new name?

It would become favoritism if officials selected companies privately, waived duties, or traded public power for political benefit. Open competition, published scoring, conflict rules, audits, and public amendments are therefore essential. A Statesman Contract must be more transparent than ordinary bargaining.

Can a company buy permission to harm the public?

No. Nonnegotiable law remains the floor. A company cannot exchange community benefits for permission to violate safety, civil-rights, environmental, or criminal law. The bargain concerns additional public value and project-specific conditions.

Can a contract truly guarantee that electricity bills never rise?

No honest agreement can guarantee that no bill will rise for any reason. Weather, fuel, storms, and unrelated changes affect rates. The Compact would protect customers from costs assigned to the project through an approved baseline and cost-allocation method.

What happens if AI eliminates more work than training can replace?

The Compact cannot answer the entire employment question. It can require companies receiving expansion rights to support transition before displacement, expand productive ownership, and share tools with workers and small businesses. Broader national policy may still be necessary.

Does the Purple Way oppose unions?

The Purple Way supports strong wages, safe work, real apprenticeships, and freedom of association. States may use union labor, open merit-based apprenticeship, or a lawful combination. The public measure is whether workers receive high standards, portable skills, and genuine opportunity.

What if no company accepts the Compact?

Then the project should not receive the requested permission or public advantage. The Purple Way is not a giveaway. Its credibility depends on the willingness to say no when the public return is inadequate.

Is this approach too complicated?

Large data centers are already technically, financially, and legally complicated. The choice is not between complexity and simplicity. It is between complexity hidden inside private negotiations and complexity governed through transparent public standards.

Chapter 16: AI Policy Assessment - What Should the Voter Choose?

An AI system does not vote, possess citizenship, or carry moral authority over the voter. The following is a reasoned policy assessment based on the legislation and the Purple Way framework described in this book. It should be judged by its evidence and logic, not accepted merely because it is labeled an AI opinion.

If the policy choice is strictly between H.R. 9442 as written and the Purple Way AI Public-Benefit Compact described here, my assessment is that voters should choose the Purple Way approach.

Evaluation criterion	H.R. 9442	Purple Way
Recognizes energy, water, labor, and safety concerns	Strong	Strong
Creates a path for a responsible project to proceed	Weak	Strong
Builds new productive capacity while regulating growth	Limited	Strong
Protects competition and smaller innovators	Uncertain	Potentially strong with open rules
Matches safety obligations to actual risk	Broad approval gate	Risk-tiered
Has a clear duration and performance pathway	Weak	Strong
Depends on transparent, competent enforcement	Yes	Yes
Overall AI policy assessment	Valid warning; overly blunt remedy	Preferred if safeguards are binding

The recommendation rests on six conclusions.

1. AOC and Sanders identify real dangers involving electricity, water, job disruption, community power, privacy, and safety.
2. H.R. 9442 responds with an indefinite covered-construction prohibition tied to a very broad future legislative settlement.
3. The bill does not provide a practical exception for a project that solves its energy, water, workforce, and community impacts under enforceable conditions.
4. A blanket pause can strengthen existing technology giants by making already-built capacity more valuable and new entry more difficult.

5. The Purple Way can preserve the bill's strongest protections while converting infrastructure demand into additional power, water resilience, skills, productive access, and household savings.
6. Phased permits, performance bonds, transparent metrics, independent audits, and automatic stop-work triggers can make the Purple Way enforceable rather than aspirational.

The recommendation is conditional. Voters should support the Purple Way only if its contracts are transparent, competitively awarded, independently verified, legally enforceable, and unable to waive core safety or civil-rights protections. A Purple label placed on an ordinary corporate subsidy would not satisfy this standard.

If those safeguards are absent, a temporary, clearly defined pause may be safer than an irresponsible deal. But between H.R. 9442's open-ended structure and a properly built Purple Way Compact, the Compact is the more balanced, productive, and future-oriented policy.

AI OPINION: Choose disciplined construction over either uncontrolled construction or an indefinite blanket freeze. Require AI companies to earn expansion by building public capacity, protecting households, developing workers, and accepting enforceable responsibility.

Conclusion: Build the Future in a Way That Builds the People

The AI debate is not only about machines. It is about power: electrical power, economic power, political power, computing power, and the power of people to remain independent in a changing economy.

A free-for-all would allow a small number of corporations to shape the nation's infrastructure and labor market while communities absorb risks they did not choose. A blanket moratorium would answer that danger by stopping covered construction until Congress resolves an enormous collection of policy disputes. One approach under-governs growth. The other may prevent responsible growth along with irresponsible growth.

The Purple Way offers a governing bargain. Let companies become wealthier by helping the people become more capable, less burdened, and more productive. Let the right to consume public capacity be joined to a duty to create new public capacity. Let safety rules be strongest where risk is greatest. Let workers receive knowledge and ownership, not abandonment. Let communities see the agreement, measure the result, and enforce the promise.

This is not hostility toward profit. It is a higher standard for profit earned through public permission. It is not government control of every invention. It is public stewardship of infrastructure whose effects reach far beyond company property.

The nation is a bank with feet. Its greatest capital walks in the knowledge, health, skill, tools, character, and productive freedom of its people. AI should add to that capital rather than replace it, exploit it, or make it permanently dependent.

The Purple Way therefore says: build the future, but build it in a way that also builds the people.

Appendix A: Model Compact Terms

Compact section	Required content	Primary remedy
Project definition	Owners, affiliates, tenants, load, phases, site, cooling, schedule, and requested public actions.	No permit until complete.
Energy and rates	Capacity plan, cost allocation, interconnection funding, reliability, protected-customer baseline, and credits.	Phase hold, reimbursement, bond recovery.
Water and environment	Water budget, source, recycling, discharge, chemicals, noise, emissions, monitoring, and emergency procedures.	Corrective action, operating limit, phase hold.
Human capital	Apprenticeships, credentials, placement targets, small-business access, transition support, and productive ownership.	Additional delivery, payment, phase hold.
Safety and rights	Risk classification, testing, incident reporting, privacy, cybersecurity, discrimination controls, and surveillance limits.	Deployment restriction, penalty, termination.
Verification	Independent auditors, data access, dashboard, reporting schedule, trade-secret rules, and public explanations.	Fine, cure order, disqualification.
Government integrity	Open scoring, conflicts, gifts, amendments, audit rights, and competitive renewal.	Void amendment, discipline, rebid.

These terms are a policy outline, not ready-to-sign legal language. A final agreement would require constitutional, procurement, antitrust, utility, environmental, labor, tax, and local-law review.

Appendix B: A Voter's Evaluation Checklist

Before supporting any AI data-center policy, a voter can ask:

- Does the policy distinguish between responsible and irresponsible projects?
- Is the duration of any moratorium clear?
- Who pays for new generation, transmission, substations, and backup capacity?
- Can household and small-business rate protection be measured?
- Are water and environmental claims independently verified?
- Do residents receive information before decisions are final?
- Are worker programs measured by completion and improved opportunity?
- Can small businesses gain practical access to AI tools and computing capacity?
- Are high-risk AI systems governed more strictly than ordinary low-risk tools?
- Can the public see the contract, performance data, amendments, and conflicts of interest?
- Is there a bond, clawback, penalty, or stop-work trigger when promises fail?
- Does the policy preserve responsible American capacity and competition?
- Does public benefit arrive as durable productive capital, or only as a temporary payment and political announcement?

The best policy should be able to answer these questions with enforceable terms rather than reassuring language.

Appendix C: Source Notes

The factual description of H.R. 9442 and the external data in this book rely principally on the following primary government sources. Interpretations, comparisons, the Purple Way proposal, and the final policy recommendation are the author's and AI's reasoned opinions.

1. H.R. 9442, Artificial Intelligence Data Center Moratorium Act, introduced June 24, 2026. U.S. Government Publishing Office. <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/BILLS-119hr9442ih/xhtml/BILLS-119hr9442ih.html>
2. U.S. Department of Energy, "DOE Releases New Report Evaluating Increase in Electricity Demand from Data Centers," December 20, 2024. <https://www.energy.gov/articles/doe-releases-new-report-evaluating-increase-electricity-demand-data-centers>
3. U.S. Department of Energy, Draft National Transmission Needs Study, July 2026, especially the discussion of projected data-center electricity demand. <https://www.energy.gov/documents/national-transmission-needs-study-draft-july-2026>
4. U.S. Government Accountability Office, "Generative AI's Environmental and Human Effects," GAO-25-107172, April 22, 2025. <https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-25-107172>
5. National Institute of Standards and Technology, Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework. <https://www.nist.gov/itl/ai-risk-management-framework>
6. National Institute of Standards and Technology, Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework: Generative Artificial Intelligence Profile, NIST AI 600-1, 2024. <https://www.nist.gov/publications/artificial-intelligence-risk-management-framework-generative-artificial-intelligence>

Appendix D: Glossary

AI Public-Benefit Compact. A proposed enforceable agreement connecting permission for major AI infrastructure to measured public protection and productive benefit.

Human Capital Conservatism. The Purple Way principle that knowledge, health, skill, tools, ownership, discipline, and productive opportunity are forms of capital that should be conserved and developed.

Local Benefit Ledger. A public record showing each project promise, delivery status, verifier, measurement, and remedy.

Productive capital. Assets and capabilities that increase real production, reduce recurring costs, or improve the ability of people to earn, save, create, and remain independent.

Public Benefit Exchange. A transparent exchange in which a private party earns a lawful public advantage by delivering independently verified public gain.

Statesman Contract. A lawful, transparent, measurable, enforceable, and reversible public agreement negotiated by a temporary steward for the benefit of the people.

The nation is a bank with feet. The Purple Way expression recognizing that the people's knowledge, health, skill, tools, ownership, and productive capacity are a living form of national wealth.